



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,131	03/27/2001	Allen Kai-Lang Yu	10007602-1	8648

7590 12/20/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/818,131

Applicant(s)

YU, ALLEN KAI-LANG

Examiner

Thuy Pardo

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Request for RCE and Remarks filed on August 26, 2004 in response to Examiner's Final Office Action has been reviewed.

2. Claims 1-14 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods US Patent No. 6,282,538 in view of Rose et al. (Hereinafter "Rose") US Patent No. 5,724,567.

As to claim 1, Woods teaches a method for receiving qualitative ratings of an overall result in response to a present user's present search request are prioritized according to an algorithm which assigns greater weight to interest indications by relatively similar users making relatively similar search requests than to interest indications by relatively dissimilar users and than to interest indications making relatively dissimilar search requests [providing the user with a

Art Unit: 2165

priority organized query list, see the abstract; generate list of matching terms and display ranked list of query hits, 10-11 of fig. 4; 540 of fig. 5; fig. 8; col. 11, lines 35-45].

However, Woods does not explicitly teach that search items returned are prioritized. Rose teaches that search items returned are prioritized [ranking each available item and indicating the degree of interest in each item of information, ab; fig. 7; col. 4, lines 40-47].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to have modified the communication service system of Woods for receiving qualitative ratings of an overall result according a search algorithm [ab; col. 11, lines 35-45] provided thereof would have incorporated the teachings of Rose especially the methodology of providing a rank of a search result to the user; the motivation being to expand and enhance the versatility of Woods' system by determining to the items of information that are believed to be important to a user [Rose, col. 2, lines 37-40].

As to claim 2, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Woods further teaches receiving a search request from a user [410 of fig. 4]; assigning said search request to a search query [430-450 of fig. 4]; and submitting said query so as to yield a set of response items [510-540 of fig. 4], and Rose further teaches assigning said user to a community [user who have similar interests, ab]; and prioritizing said response items as a function of prior search requests by said community [col. 5, lines 36 to col. 6, lines 17; ab].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 3, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Woods further teaches tracking indications of interest by said user in individual ones of said response items and storing the results of said tracking on a per user and/or per-community basis [ab].

As to claim 4, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches using said results in prioritizing items collected in response to subsequent search requests by other users assigned to said community [col. 5, lines 36 to col. 6, lines 17].

As to claim 5, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches that all else being equal, interest indications associated with a community are given greater weight than other interest indications by the parent of said community [col. 6, lines 45 to col. 7, lines 49].

As to claim 6, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches that said user is assigned to a community in part as a function of said indications of interest [ab; col. 5, lines 36 to col. 6, lines 17].

As to claim 7, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches that said user is assigned to a community as a function of a selection of said community by said user [col. 5, lines 36 to col. 6, lines 17].

As to claim 8, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches said user is assigned to a community as a function of a profile of said user existing before said search request is made [col. 5, lines 36 to col. 6, lines 17].

As to claim 10, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches a trader for tracking indications of interest by a user in search items collected in response to said search request from said user [fig. 7], said prioritizer using said indications of interest to determine said function for future queries [col. 5, lines 30-35].

As to claim 11, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches said community assigner assigns said user to a community for said future search requests at least in part as a function of said indications of interest [ab].

As to claim 12, Woods and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Rose further teaches a user and/or a community field indicating respective users and/or communities associated with said hit counts [users who have similar interests, see fig. 5; col. 2, lines 37-44].

As to claims 9, 13-14, all limitations of this claim have been addressed in the analysis above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biffar in view of Rose et al. (Hereinafter "Rose") US Patent No. 5,724,567.

As to claim 1, Biffar teaches a method for receiving qualitative ratings of an overall result in response to a present user's present search request are prioritized according to an algorithm which assigns greater weight to interest indications by relatively similar users making relatively similar search requests than to interest indications by relatively dissimilar users and than to interest indications making relatively dissimilar search requests [see the abstract; fig. 8; col. 11, lines 35-45].

However, Biffar does not explicitly teach that search items returned are prioritized. Rose teaches that search items returned are prioritized [ranking each available item and indicating the degree of interest in each item of information, ab; fig. 7; col. 4. lines 40-47].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to have modified the communication service system of Biffar for receiving qualitative ratings of an overall result according a search algorithm [ab; col. 11, lines 35-45] provided thereof would have incorporated the teachings of Rose especially the methodology of providing a rank of a search result to the user; the motivation being to expand and enhance the versatility of Biffar's system by determining to the items of information that are believed to be important to a user [Rose, col. 2, lines 37-40].

As to claim 2, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches

receiving a search request from a user [col. 7, lines 31-33];

assigning said user to a community [ab; col. 7, lines 49-61; col. 2, lines 56 to col. 3, lines 14];

assigning said search request to a search query [fig. 3-4];

submitting said query so as to yield a set of response items [ab; col. 7, lines 62 to col. 8, lines 7]; and

prioritizing said response items as a function of prior search requests by said community [col. 11, lines 41-45].

As to claim 3, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches tracking indications of interest by said user in individual ones of said response items and

Art Unit: 2165

storing the results of said tracking on a per user and/or per-community basis [col. 11, lines 53 to col. 12, lines 10].

As to claim 4, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches using said results in prioritizing items collected in response to subsequent search requests by other users assigned to said community [col. 11, lines 54-62].

As to claim 5, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches that all else being equal, interest indications associated with a community are given greater weight than other interest indications by the parent of said community [col. 4, lines 28-67].

As to claim 6, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches that said user is assigned to a community in part as a function of said indications of interest [col. 5, lines 4-9].

As to claim 7, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches that said user is assigned to a community as a function of a selection of said community by said user [col. 3, lines 25-35].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 8, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches said user is assigned to a community as a function of a profile of said user existing before said search request is made [col. 4, lines 28-65].

As to claim 10, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches a trader for tracking indications of interest by a user in search items collected in response to said search request from said user, said prioritizer using said indications of interest to determine said function for future queries [col. 7, lines 54-61].

As to claim 11, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed. Biffar further teaches said community assigner assigns said user to a community for said future search requests at least in part as a function of said indications of interest [col. 8, lines 35-56].

As to claim 12, Biffar and Rose teach the invention substantially as claimed, comprising: a key field identifying hit counts, a second field indicating a values for respective hit counts, a query context field indicating query contexts for respective hit counts, and a user and/or a community field indicating respective users and/or communities associated with said hit counts [see fig. 5].

As to claims 9, 13-14, all limitations of this claim have been addressed in the analysis above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicant argues that Biffar teaches prioritizing a single item.

As to point this, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Biffar teaches returning the search results and ranking the search results using various methodologies such as frequency of a site visited [col. 1, lines 28-30]. Each item from search results was ranked based on priority characteristics [see col. 11, lines 27-44; for example, Mercedes sport utility vehicle was ranked number one (first row), Durango sports vehicle is in the second row, and the Lincoln Navigator with a third row, col. 12, lines 40-50].

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the Biffar and Rose references.

As to this point, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Rose compensates Biffar's deficiency by prioritizing the search returned items based on the indication of the degree of interest in each item [see the abstract; fig. 7; col. 4, lines 40-47].

Applicant argues that Biffar does not disclose a community.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Biffar teaches that the system is profiling, i.e. it learns from all searches of all users and combines the user profile and patterns of similar users [col. 7, lines 52-61].

8. Applicant's arguments filed on August 26, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at 571-272-4083.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows: (703) 872-9306 (Official Communication)

and/or:

571-273-4082 (Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions).

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2165

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

December 09, 2004



THUY N. PARDO
PRIMARY EXAMINER